REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated March 21, 2005.

The double patenting objection in section 2 of the Office Action has been addressed by the changes to claims 72-74 and 91 herein. Claims 72-74 now depend from claim 75, whereas claim 91 now depends from claim 92. These changes address and overcome the double patenting objection raised by the Examiner in paragraph 2 of the Office Action.

Claim 61 stands rejected under Section 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yamahara in view of Maekawa, Jones and Mochizuki. This 4-way Section 103(a) rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 61 requires an antiglare layer having *all* of (a) a haze value of at least 40, (b) image clarity of at least 10, and (c) both an internal scattering layer and scattering surface. However, no cited reference discloses an antiglare layer having *all* of these features. For example, the "etching glass" of Mochizuki has (a), but does not have (b) and (c). There is no disclosure or suggestion in the cited art of an antiglare layer having each of (a) through (c), or even how to achieve an antiglare layer having all of (a) through (c). The cited art is unrelated to the invention of claim 61 in this respect. Claim 79 defines over the cited art in a similar manner.

In particular, Mochizuki discloses a diffusing plate which in Example 1 is a resin layer, in Example 2 is an etching glass, in Example 3 is an acrylic resin coating including TiO_2 particles, and in Example 4 is a polarizing plate of which the outer surface is roughened by a heat roller. However, Mochizuki fails to disclose or suggest that the diffusing plate has an internal scattering layer and a scattering surface. Furthermore, Mochizuki fails to disclose or suggest obtaining a value of transmitted image clarity of at least 10 by using a diffusing plate having an internal scattering layer and a scattering surface.

In contrast, the antiglare layer of claim 61 has an internal scattering layer and a scattering surface, and can obtain image clarity of at least 10, so that a good balance between the specular reflection characteristic for light incident thereupon from the viewer side (high haze value) and the specular transmission characteristic for light transmitted therethrough (high value of transmitted image clarity) can be attained (e.g., see paragraph 0027 of the instant specification). Mochizuki (as well as the other cited art) fails to disclose or suggest an antiglare layer which can achieve a combination of a high haze value of at least 40 and a high transmitted image clarity of at least 10. Nothing in the cited art suggests such an antiglare layer with such a good balance between specular reflection characteristic for light incident thereupon from the viewer side (high haze value) and specular transmission characteristic for light transmitted therethrough (high value of transmitted image clarity). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the invention of claim 61 (and 79) is not met by the cited art.

Those in the art recognize such advantages. The *non-prior-art* Nitto Denko Technical Report Vol. 40, Sept. 2002, published some 2 years *after* the priority date of the instant application, states in the "Anti-Glare Design for High Definition LCDs" section that "[c]onsequently, optimizing the surface roughness and internal scattering makes it possible to create anti-glare films that show outstanding properties compared with those of conventional films." This paper evidences the unexpected advantages associated with an anti-glare film that combines an internal scattering layer and a scattering surface.

Claim 121 requires each of (i) an internal scattering layer, (ii) particles in the polymer matrix, and (iii) refractive index difference of from 0.03 to 0.10. The cited art fails to disclose or suggest this. In particular, even if the etching glass of Mochizuki was used to get a high haze value, such glass would *not* have the (i) internal scattering layer, (ii) the particles in the polymer

matrix, and (iii) refractive index difference of from 0.03 to 0.10 as called for in claim 121. Thus, even if the etching glass of Mochizuki was used, the invention of claim 121 would not be met. There is no suggestion in the cited art of an antiglare layer having all of these features, or for how to obtain such a layer.

It is respectfully requested that all rejections be withdrawn. All claims are in condition for allowance. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with regard to the same.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____

Joseph A. Rhoa
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100